



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/584,306 | 05/31/2000 | Eric James | 99EC035/77526 3172 | | |
| ; | 7590 01/02/2003 | | | | |
| Welsh & Katz LTD 22nd Floor 120 South Riverside Plaza | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | NGUYEN, QUYNH H | | |
| Chicago, IL 6 | 60606 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2642 | 2642 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

M

| 7 | | per- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 09/584,306 | JAMES, ERIC | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Quynh H Nguyen | 2642 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 311 | <u>May 2000</u> . | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th | is action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office Ac | tion Summary | Part of Paper No. 2 | | | | |

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-43, and 46-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacenda (U.S. Patent 5,822,418).

Regarding claims 1 and 23, Yacenda teaches automatically monitor entities in a call center ("PBX/ACD")(col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 2); selecting an entity (Fig. 1, 17).

Yacenda does not teach modifying configuration information of the selected entity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the step of modifying configuration information of the selected entity in Yacenda's system in order to allow user to have more control over the selected entity.

Regarding claim 2, Yacenda teaches monitoring physical location information of entities to provide and updated electronic floor plan (col. 4, lines 60-64).

Regarding claims 3, 14, 15, 35, and 36, Yacenda does not teach physical location information includes Cartesian coordinates, latitude and longitude meridians, and radius vector and angle and proper Cartesian coordinates can be graphically represented on the

electronic floor plan. It would have been obvious that if entity 17 in Fig. 1 move from telephone 12 physical location to telephone 14 or 16, the Cartesian coordinates also changed, furthermore proper Cartesian coordinates are needed to draw the electronic floor plan.

Regarding claims 4, 24 and 46, Yacenda teaches entities includes agent/personnel 17, consoles (Fig. 1, 12 and col. 4, lines 60-64). Yacenda does not teach printers and facsimile. It would have been obvious that any working station would have at least a printer and facsimile for better serve customer.

Regarding claims 5, 19, 25, 39, and 47, Yacenda does not teach electronic floor plan includes a bit map image, vector graphics, object oriented graphics, and VRML representation of the call center. It would have been obvious that bit map image, vector graphics, object oriented graphics, and VRML are used for computer display.

Regarding claims 6, 26 and 48, Yacenda teaches monitoring changes ("updated" – col. 4, lines 62-64) would be obviously comparing physical location at a second time with physical location at a first time in order to only display the updated information.

Regarding claims 7, 27 and 49, Yacenda does not teach notifying a supervisor if the physical location information has been changed. It would have been obvious that one of the purpose of monitoring physical location of an entity in a call center is to notify the supervisor.

Regarding claims 8 and 28, 16 and 37, Yacenda teaches recording physical location information; and retrieving the recorded physical location information (col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 3). Yacenda does not teach improper location information is maintained in a list of entities without physical location information. It would have been

obvious that improper location information is not needed for graphical image on the electronic floor plan.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 29, and 30, Yacenda does not teach the physical location is entered by a call center user or server computer. In Yacenda's system, the receiver/sensor and transmitter automatically recorded physical location, otherwise, it would have been obvious that the physical location needed to be entered.

Claims 11 and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 8.

Regarding claims 12, 32, and 33, Yacenda teaches the recorded physical location information is determined by getting physical location information from a database (Fig. 1A, 135 and 145).

Regarding claims 13, 17, 18, 34, 38, and 52, Yacenda does not teach translating includes using a look-up table to create a relationship between physical location information and graphical form and placing graphical image and using bit map drawing tools to produce two-dimensional image of the electronic floor plan. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that lookingup table to create a relationship between physical information and graphical form, graphical image are necessary for drawing the electronic floor.

Regarding claims 20 and 40, Yacenda teaches identifying an entity which has physically moved (col. 4, lines 60-62).

Regarding claims 21, 41, and 22, 42, 43, 50, Yacenda does not teach the electronic floor plan is updated with a prediction of physical location information based upon a history of physical location information and is archived and retrieved for later

analysis. It would have been very useful in call center environment that prediction of physical location information based upon a history of physical location information and is archived and retrieved for later analysis in order to assist supervisor in planning.

Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that 3. form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
- 4. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yacenda et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,418).

Regarding claims 44 and 45, Yacenda teaches the steps of: an entity monitor comprises a programmable computer which monitors entities for physical location information to provide an electronic floor plan (col. 6, lines 57-60); and an informer that updates the electronic floor plan to provide and reflect changes in physical location information of the entities (col. 4, lines 60-64).

Conclusions

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fuller et al. (U.S. Patent 6,026,153) teaches personal communicator telephone system. Theimer et al. (U.S. Paten 5,493,692) teaches selective delivery of electronic messages in a multiple computer system based on context and environment of a user.

Art Unit: 2642

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry,

please

label the response "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

or: (703) 308-6296, (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Art Unit: 2642

qhn

Quynh H.Nguyen December 30, 2002 Harry S. Hong

HARRY S. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER